1 MICHAEL D. RAWLINS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 5467 **DURHAM JONES & PINEGAR** 10785 West Twain Avenue, #200 Las Vegas, NV 89135 Telephone: (702) 870-6060 Facsimile: (702) 870-6090 Email: mrawlins@diplaw.com Attorney for Defendant 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 8 PRO-TECT SECURITY SERVICES, LLC, 9 a Nevada Limited Liability Company, Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-01685-JAD-NJK 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 13 **INTEGRATED SYSTEM** IMPROVEMENT SERVICES, INC. d/b/a 14 SPECIAL INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, an Arizona Corporation. 15 Defendant. 16 17 18 STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE FEDERAL RULE 26(f) 19 **CONFERENCE (SECOND REQUEST)** 20 Plaintiff Pro-Tect Security Services, LLC by and through its counsel of record, 21 Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq. and Adam Wax, Esq. of the law firm Kravitz, Schnitzer & Johnson, 22 Chtd., and Integrated Systems Improvement Services Inc. d/b/a Special Intelligence 23 Services, by and through its counsel of record, Michael D. Rawlins, Esq. of the law firm 24 Durham Jones & Pinegar, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the Federal Rule 26(f) 25 conference deadline for an additional 30 days, to October 27, 2017. 26 This request is made to allow counsel to continue to investigate a possible conflict 27 of interest. Plaintiff's principal has used defendant's counsel's firm for legal 28

V 3454174.1

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

services, and plaintiff's counsel has raised the issue whether defendant's counsel has a conflict of interest. Defendant's counsel has provided its position to plaintiff, and plaintiff has responded. Defendant's counsel is now evaluating the conflict based on information provided by plaintiff and a detailed review of their files.

Counsel have discussed this issue, have exchanged correspondence on the same, and have concluded there is a need to continue the conference deadline from September 27, 2017 to October 27, 2017 to allow the parties to explore the make informed decisions about the conflicts issue. The parties believe that sharing of information and consultation with conflicts counsel is prudent at this time. If the parties are unable to come to an agreement, it is possible that a motion for disqualification will be filed by plaintiff.

This extension is made for good cause and not for purposes of delay.

## IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED.

KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER & JOHNSON

Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq.

NV Bar No.395

Adam J. Wax, Esq.

NV Bar No. 12126

Las Vegas, NV 89123 Attorneys for Plaintiff **DURHAM JONES & PINEGAR** 

Michael D. Rawlins NV Bar No. 5467

10785 W. Twain Ave., Suite 200

Las Vegas, NV 89135 Attorneys for Defendant

IT IS SO ORDERED.

8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200

Dated: September 27, 2017

UNITED STATES MACISTRATE JUDGE